

Environmental Context of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign:

**Findings from In-Depth Discussions
with Representatives of National
Organizations and State Prevention
Coordinators**

Delivered to:

National Institute on Drug Abuse
National Institutes of Health

Submitted by:

WESTAT
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850
(301) 251-1500

Contract No.
N01DA-8-5063

May 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was produced for the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) by Westat under the Evaluation of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, Contract Number N01DA-8-5063. The NIDA project officer is Susan Martin. A special thanks is given to Susan David, the prior NIDA project officer, for her helpful input into design of this evaluation component. The primary writers of this report are Susan Berkowitz and Cynthia Robins of Westat. David Maklan, Westat, and Robert Hornik, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, serve as Co-Principal Investigators on the contract. Diane Cadell, Westat, is the Project Director. The data collection team at Westat consists of Susan Berkowitz, Wendy Jarmuth, Wendy Kissin, Caroline McLeod, Mary Ann Myers, Cynthia Robins and Mervin Ruiz. Finally, special recognition is given to the 51 State Prevention Coordinators and the representatives of the 12 participating national organizations, without whose cooperation this component would have been impossible to carry out.

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	v
1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Background to the Media Campaign and the Evaluation	1-1
1.2 The In-Depth Discussion Component: An Overview	1-2
1.3 Methodology	1-4
1.3.1 Discussion Guides	1-4
1.3.2 Training and Quality Control.....	1-5
1.3.3 Data Collection, Preparation, and Analysis.....	1-5
1.4 Organization of This Report	1-6
References	1-6
2 National Organizations' Views of and Relationships with the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.....	2-1
2.1 Overview of Findings for National Organizations	2-1
2.2 Substance Abuse-Focused Organizations' Reactions to the Media Campaign.....	2-2
2.3 Youth-Development and Parent-Service Organizations' Reactions to the Media Campaign	2-5
2.3.1 The Two Organizations Most Positive About and Involved with the Media Campaign	2-5
2.3.2 Organizations Involved with the Campaign, but with Concerns about the Continuity of the Relationship	2-7
2.3.3 Organizations Less Involved with the Campaign.....	2-10
2.3.4 Organizations Least Involved with the Campaign	2-13
2.4 Conclusions	2-13
3 Impact of the Media Campaign on State Prevention Activities.....	3-1
3.1 Introduction.....	3-1
3.2 Overview of Findings from State Prevention Coordinators.....	3-1
3.3 Reactions of State Prevention Coordinators to the Media Campaign.....	3-3
3.3.1 Ads Are Positive and Reinforce State Efforts.....	3-3
3.3.2 Adjust Message Form and Content to More Closely Match Local Issues.....	3-4
3.3.3 Resolve Problems with the Pro Bono Match	3-5
3.4 Positive Media Campaign Effects on Some State Efforts	3-5
3.4.1 States Participated in the Shaping and Targeting of Ads	3-6
3.4.2 Campaign Created an Opportunity to Link State Prevention Resources and Programming to Advertisements.....	3-6
3.4.3 Create Buy-In From the Local Media.....	3-7
3.5 Conclusion	3-8

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
4	Summary and Conclusions	4-1
4.1	Overview	4-1
4.2	Respondent Findings	4-1
4.2.1	Ads and Messages Viewed Favorably	4-1
4.2.2	Respondents Support Use of Anti-Drug Ads to Combat Pro-Drug Messages	4-1
4.2.3	Respondents Would Like to See Alcohol and Tobacco Addressed	4-2
4.2.4	Positive Responses to Collaboration	4-2
4.3	Respondent Recommendations	4-3
4.3.1	Continue the Media Campaign, Adapting It to Changing Substance Use Patterns	4-3
4.3.2	Include Alcohol and Tobacco	4-3
4.3.3	Work at Creating and Sustaining Effective Partnerships	4-3
4.3.4	Target Policymakers and Decisionmakers with “Prevention Works” Messages	4-4

List of Appendices

Appendix

A	Discussion Guides	A-1
B	Summary Form	B-1

Executive Summary

Representatives of 12 major national organizations and State Prevention Coordinators in all 50 states and the District of Columbia were generally very positive about the messages conveyed by the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign launched by the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) to persuade America's youth to reject illicit drugs. Respondents felt that Media Campaign messages reinforce their own messages encouraging young people to find healthy alternatives to drug use and help to raise public awareness of the issue of illicit drugs among youth. At the same time, respondents were less enthusiastic about the role of the Media Campaign as an organizational partner in helping to bolster local substance abuse prevention efforts. These are the main findings of this study of the environmental context of the Media Campaign, part of a larger evaluation conducted by Westat under contract to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA).

Launched under the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-61), the Media Campaign is a social marketing and advertising program whose primary goal is to educate and enable America's youth to reject illicit drugs, especially marijuana and inhalants. Other goals are convincing occasional users of these and other illicit drugs to stop using drugs; enhancing adult perceptions of the harm associated with adolescent use of marijuana and inhalants; and letting parents, other influential adults, and peer role models know that their actions can make a critical difference in helping prevent youth drug use.

The Media Campaign is now in Phase III, which began in September 1999, and will continue to at least 2003. The Media Campaign attempts to reach the target audience directly and indirectly, through both traditional and nontraditional channels. The primary vehicle for reaching the Campaign's goals is targeted paid advertising in a range of media to youth (aged 9 to 18), parents of youth in this age range, and other influential adults. Although paid advertising is by far its largest focus, Phase III also has nonadvertising components. Of most relevance to this research is the component that involves forming partnerships with civic, professional, and community groups in order to buttress and reinforce existing drug prevention efforts in communities. All Media Campaign activities taken as a whole are designed to foster or enhance an environment in which drug use is noticed, recognized as a problem, and discussed.

Phase III of the Media Campaign is being evaluated by Westat and its subcontractor, the Annenberg School for Communication, under contract to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). The evaluation's main component is the National Survey of Parents and Youth (NSPY), a longitudinal effort to assess Media Campaign effects on parents and youth over time. This report gives findings from a much smaller piece of the evaluation that considers the environmental context surrounding the Campaign and explores the partnership component through in-depth guided telephone discussions with representatives of national partner organizations and State Substance Abuse Prevention Coordinators.

In fall 2001, open-ended in-depth guided telephone discussions were carried out with representatives of 12 national organizations partnering with the Media Campaign and with State Prevention Coordinators from all 50 States and the District of Columbia. One focus of these open-ended discussions was to explore the respondents' knowledge and views of the Media Campaign. This included exploring any interactions they had with the Campaign and perceptions as to whether and

how it had affected or contributed to their work in substance abuse prevention. Respondents were also asked to talk about challenges faced in their own work, as well as their desired future priorities for the field and specific recommendations for the Media Campaign.

The national youth service and parent-oriented organizations were purposively selected to represent a range of constituencies. All have an organizational network enabling them to diffuse messages and materials to local chapters or affiliates. It was anticipated that representatives of these organizations would be familiar with the Campaign by virtue of their organizations' status as Campaign partners. By speaking with them, it would be possible to obtain some sense of how the Campaign's partnership strategy has been working and whether it has helped to buttress or energize substance abuse prevention activities or diffuse substance abuse prevention messages to local chapters or affiliates across the country.

By contrast, there was no expectation that State Prevention Coordinators would necessarily know about or be affected by the Media Campaign, because working with these state-level groups was never an explicit part of the Campaign partnership strategy. Nevertheless, since most represent their states to the National Prevention Network and are usually responsible for disbursing Federal Block Grant monies to localities, the Prevention Coordinators would be in an ideal position to provide an informed overview of the current state of substance abuse prevention across the country. It would be an open question as to whether and how such an overview might also include their perceptions of any Media Campaign influences on prevention efforts and substance abuse issues in their states and communities.

Highlights of the key findings follow.

- Both the representatives of national organizations and the State Prevention Coordinators were quite positive about the Media Campaign ads and messages. The underlying concept of finding an “anti-drug”—a positive alternative to drug use—is consistent with efforts across the nation to encourage young people to adopt healthy lifestyles and activities. The “anti-drug” theme also supports a general movement in prevention science to educate people on what they should do, rather than lecturing them on what not to do.
- Respondents were also enthusiastic about Media Campaign ads encouraging parents to communicate with their children and monitor their children's behavior. This is consistent with the findings from the NSPY that indicate a reasonably optimistic picture of Campaign effects on parents based on data collected through June 2001.
- There was a broad consensus among respondents that the Media Campaign has done a good job of bringing youth substance abuse issues onto the “radar screen” of public awareness. Many agreed that the Media Campaign acts as a counterweight to the influence of pro-drug messages in the media.
- Responses were more qualified when it came to the Media Campaign as an organizational partner. The national organizations can be arrayed on a continuum from those very knowledgeable about and involved with the Campaign, to those with an on-paper only relationship. Most fell somewhere in the middle. Not unexpectedly, all but a few State Prevention Coordinators were unaware of any nonadvertising component of the Campaign. The four most familiar with all facets of the Campaign were from states with metropolitan areas that had participated in Phase I of the Media Campaign.

- Several representatives of national organizations complained of a lapse in communication with the Media Campaign over the previous year and associated uncertainty about the continuing status of collaborative projects initiated under the pro bono match program. (A program in which media are required to contribute an amount equal to the value of the paid ads in Public Service Advertising (PSA) or other in-kind contributions). Several of the State Prevention Coordinators also expressed confusion about the ongoing status of this program.
- Although several national organization representatives had engaged in collaborative projects with the Campaign, only two felt that partnering with the Media Campaign had made a real difference to their substance abuse prevention efforts. Four State Prevention Coordinators, all from states with metropolitan areas that had participated in Phase I, noted a similar serendipitous positive Campaign impact on their efforts. Interestingly, across both groups these respondents articulated the same factors as having contributed to the strength of the impact of and relationship to the Media Campaign. Central among these factors was the perception of having been treated in a collegial fashion with a view to the mutual benefits of the relationship, allowing for give-and-take, and enabling all parties to use their knowledge and skills to best advantage.
- Respondent recommendations for the Media Campaign included continuing the Media Campaign and adapting it to changing youth substance abuse patterns; working more effectively at creating and sustaining partnerships, especially improving communication; and, targeting policymakers and decisionmakers with “prevention works” messages.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background to the Media Campaign and the Evaluation

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) launched the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign (the Media Campaign) in 1998 as part of an effort to realize the goals of the *National Drug Control Strategy*. Under the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-61), Congress approved funding for a “national media campaign to reduce and prevent drug use among young Americans.” The Media Campaign is a social marketing and advertising program whose four primary goals are to:

- Educate and enable America’s youth to reject illicit drugs, especially marijuana and inhalants;
- Convince occasional users of these and other illicit drugs to stop using drugs;
- Enhance adult perceptions of the harm associated with adolescent use of marijuana and inhalants; and,
- Let parents, other influential adults, and peer role models know that their actions can make a critical difference in helping prevent youth drug use.

The enabling legislation prohibits the Media Campaign from addressing alcohol and tobacco in the paid advertising component.

The Media Campaign is now in Phase III. Phase I involved pilot testing the intervention in 12 metropolitan areas, using existing Partnership for a Drug Free America (PDFA) ads in a limited range of media. In Phase II, these advertisements appeared nationwide, some new advertisements were added, and ads appeared in a wider range of media. In its current phase, which began in September 1999 and will continue to at least 2003, the Campaign is “an integrated social marketing and public health communications campaign” that attempts to reach the target audience directly and indirectly, through both traditional and nontraditional channels.

Targeted paid advertising to youth (aged 9 to 18), parents of youth in this age range, and other influential adults is the primary vehicle for reaching these goals. As of August 2001, the paid advertising plan has shifted creative focus to 11-to 14-year olds to allow the Campaign to more effectively reach youth at a time they are most at risk for drug trial (National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign Communication Strategy Statement Supplement, August 2001). Although the paid advertising is by far the largest focus of the Campaign, Phase III also includes nonadvertising components, which are being carried out by a public relations firm. The component of particular relevance to this report involves forming partnerships with civic, professional, and community groups. By working with the partner organizations, the Media Campaign seeks to buttress and reinforce existing drug prevention efforts in communities. More broadly, taken as a whole, Media Campaign activities are designed to foster or enhance an environment in which drug use is noticed, recognized as a problem, and discussed.

The appropriations language for the Media Campaign requires that each paid advertising slot be accompanied by a donation of equal value by the media for public service messages or activities. Known as the pro bono match, this involves one-to-one matching time for public service announcements (PSAs) or in-kind programming. PSAs, whether on television, radio, print or the Internet, should have an aggregate value of at least 51% of the total match value. Other in-kind public service activities may include a range of efforts, such as development or maintenance of web-sites or web-site components, locally or nationally sponsored community events, town hall meetings, or duplication or distribution of videos. These can have a value of up to 49% of the total match value. Although by law the Campaign paid advertising focuses exclusively on anti-drug themes, these pro bono advertising spots or other in-kind activities may address a range of issues promoting healthy activities, behavior and environments that deter youth from substance use and abuse. These may include anti-alcohol messages, as well as themes of good parenting, mentoring, and fostering high expectations and self-esteem for youth. In the second half of 2001, print feature stories (as of 6/30/01) and television and radio programming (as of 9/30/01), but not PSAs, were excluded from eligibility for the pro bono match credit. In addition, between September 2000 and December 2001, provisions for a Local Media Match Task Force and associated local media match process were eliminated, although the process continues at the national level.¹ Thus, the pro bono match program in its current form has eliminated two categories of in-kind matches (print feature stories and radio and television programming) and the local match component of the program. Otherwise, it remains the same in essential emphasis.

Phase III of the Media Campaign is being evaluated by Westat and its subcontractor, the Annenberg School for Communication, under contract to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). The main component of the evaluation is the National Survey of Parents and Youth (NSPY) that tracks attitudes and behaviors with respect to illicit drug use along with measures of exposure to Media Campaign advertising and messages. Its goal is to assess Media Campaign effects on parents and youth over time.²

This report gives findings from another, much smaller piece of the evaluation that considers the environmental context surrounding the Campaign and explores the partnership component of the Media Campaign through in-depth guided telephone discussions with representatives of national partner organizations as well as State Substance Abuse Prevention Coordinators. Further understanding of the Campaign's environmental context will come from analyzing demographic information on survey respondents using Census data, which will be incorporated into the final report (April, 2004); examining NSPY respondents' information on their community involvement and perceptions of the changing media environment; and monitoring the frequency of drug stories from 5 years before the Campaign through the Campaign period.

1.2 The In-Depth Discussion Component: An Overview

In-depth guided telephone discussions were conducted with representatives of 12 national organizations and State Prevention Coordinators in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The discussions with these respondents were largely open-ended and covered a variety of subjects,

¹ As shall be seen, these changes to the pro bono match program, which were in progress when the telephone discussions occurred in fall 2001, caused considerable confusion among respondents.

² For more on the results of this evaluation component to date, see *Evaluation of the National Youth-Anti-Drug Media Campaign: Third Semi-Annual Report of Findings*, Westat: Rockville, MD. October 2001.

including their work in substance abuse prevention and future priorities for the field, as well as their assessments of the priority given to substance abuse issues in the policy arena and the media. This report, however, mainly focuses on what these respondents said about their knowledge and views of the Media Campaign; any interactions they had with the Campaign; and their perceptions of whether and how the Campaign may have affected or contributed to their own work in substance abuse prevention. The primary purpose of this report is to explore the respondents' perceptions of the Media Campaign's influence on the activities of selected national partner organizations and on substance abuse prevention policies and efforts at the state level. The views expressed in this report are those of the respondents.

These two sets of respondents were selected for somewhat different reasons. The first group consisted of representatives of 12 major national youth service and parent-focused organizations that are partnering with the Media Campaign and have local chapters or affiliates across the country. The goal of these interviews was to get a sense of how the Campaign's partnering strategy has been working, and whether it has helped to buttress or energize substance abuse prevention activities or diffuse substance abuse prevention messages to local chapters or affiliates across the country. This would provide some perspective, albeit indirect, on the effects of the Media Campaign in local communities, a subject not directly pursued by the outcome evaluation, due to limited time and resources.

Given limitations on time and resources, the evaluation team decided that a well-selected group of 12 organizations would be a broad enough representation to give some sense of how the Media Campaign partnering strategy had been working over the previous 2 years. For this reason, partner organizations representing a range of constituencies were selected. They are the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, The Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts of America, The Boys and Girls Clubs of America, The Young Men's Christian Association, The Young Women's Christian Association, The Future Farmers of America, the National Parent Teachers Organization, Parenting Coalition International, the National Urban League, and the League of Latin American Citizens. It should be stressed that this is a purposive sample that does not allow generalizations from these 12 cases to all national partner organizations, although at least some of the issues would likely be the same for other partner organizations.

The second respondent group consisted of State Prevention Coordinators in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Unlike the selected national organizations, the Media Campaign has no explicit strategy of partnering with groups at the state level. Nevertheless, State Prevention Coordinators, who typically represent their state in the National Prevention Network, are usually responsible for distributing Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant monies to local entities, and may also oversee other grant-related activities. Given this group's activities, collectively, they would be in a good position to provide an informed overview of the current state of substance abuse prevention across the country. Such an overview would also include their perceptions of any Media Campaign influences on prevention efforts and substance abuse issues in their states and communities. In this case, to achieve a comprehensive overview and "take the pulse" of prevention nationwide, it made sense to speak with all the State Prevention Coordinators rather than selecting just a few regional representatives as respondents.

A key difference between the two groups, then, was that the national organization representatives, though not necessarily specialized in substance abuse issues, would be likely to know about and be at least marginally connected to the Media Campaign. By contrast, the State Coordinators were not

necessarily expected to have connections to the Media Campaign, although it would be an open question to find out whether and how they thought the Media Campaign might have contributed to their prevention efforts at the state and community levels. These differences should be kept in mind when reading Chapters 2 and 3.

1.3 Methodology

As noted above, this component of the evaluation took a qualitative approach of conducting open-ended, guided telephone discussions with the selected respondents. Rather than simply collecting information, the discussion leaders were interested in carrying on a conversation with the respondents, and hearing their views on their work in prevention as well as their perceptions of the Media Campaign. This approach works well when it is important to understand how a respondent views issues in his or her own framework of understanding. Because of their discursive or conversational format, guided discussions are best suited to situations in which the interviewer is trying to develop a working understanding of the respondent's views in the respondents own terms, and in relation to how the respondent integrates these views into an overall perspective. Guided discussions are also suited to probing topics in depth and in a variety of ways (Berkowitz, 1996, p. 59).

The specific steps we followed in conducting these discussions and analyzing the data are outlined briefly below.

1.3.1 Discussion Guides

Once there was agreement on a general set of topics to be addressed in the telephone discussions, an open-ended guide was developed to be used by discussion leaders to facilitate the discussions and ensure that all would cover essentially the same ground. Slightly different versions were developed for use with national organization representatives and State Prevention Coordinators.

The guides cover the following areas:

- Perceptions of the youth drug use situation;
- Attention accorded to youth substance use in the legal and policy arenas and in the media;
- Current and future substance abuse prevention efforts;
- Perceived influence of the Media Campaign; and
- Major barriers/Future priorities for substance abuse prevention.

Copies of both guides can be found in Appendix A. It should be noted that even though there was interest in knowing about reactions to the Media Campaign, both guides were designed so that respondents would first be asked about their own prevention efforts and plans. From this it would be possible to see if the Media Campaign and any collaborative efforts spontaneously emerged as subjects for discussion, or if it was necessary to specifically introduce the Media Campaign before respondents addressed the topic. In short, the objective was not to "lead" respondents into overstating their familiarity with the Media Campaign or exaggerating its influence on their activities, but to learn

about the respondent organizations' and state's own efforts in prevention as grounding for discussion of the Campaign.

1.3.2 Training and Quality Control

Seven Westat project staff, including the task manager, conducted the telephone discussions. The discussion leaders were trained in a 1-day session held in early September 2001. The session oriented the discussion leaders to the main objectives of the Media Campaign as well as the overall design of the larger evaluation. Most emphasis was placed on familiarizing the discussion leaders with the objectives of the in-depth discussion component, reinforcing the basic rationale for and techniques of conducting open-ended discussions, and reviewing the discussion guides in considerable depth and detail. Discussion leaders were also instructed in filling out the summary forms, which provided a common format for summarizing key points of each discussion, and commenting on any situation-specific factors influencing the conversation that could potentially affect the interpretation of the transcript data. Appendix B provides an example of a Discussion Summary Form.

After training, the task manager applied several quality control techniques. Before the guided telephone discussions began in earnest in mid-September, the task manager simulated practice discussions with staff less experienced in this kind of open-ended technique. Once the actual discussions were underway, she reviewed the audio tapes of the first two discussions conducted by each of the discussion leaders, providing comments and feedback on areas of strength as well as those that needed improvement. In addition, after the first few weeks of discussions, the entire group reassembled to evaluate how the discussions had gone thus far, raised any outstanding questions, and fine-tuned minor modifications to the discussion guide. Finally, the task manager provided feedback on discussion summaries to individual discussion leaders throughout the data collection period.

1.3.3 Data Collection, Preparation, and Analysis

Data collection began the second week of September and lasted until the first week of November 2001. Lists of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the state directors for all 50 states and the District of Columbia were obtained from the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD). Similar contact information was obtained from ONDCP for respondents in the selected national organizations. Next, a letter was sent to all state directors and to the national organizations informing them of the study, soliciting their participation, and requesting the names and contact information for the Prevention Coordinator in their state or the appropriate person or persons in their organization with whom to speak. The letters were followed up by telephone calls to obtain this information and then a second set of letters was mailed to the designated individuals informing them of the study and letting them know that someone would be calling them soon to schedule the telephone discussion.

In all, 64 discussions were completed (13 with national organization representatives, 51 with state coordinators including the Washington, DC representative). In some cases, two or three respondents were involved during one discussion. There were no refusals, although in a few cases, additional information was provided to other persons in the state or national organization before the respondent could agree to participate. Discussions varied in length from 20 to 90 minutes, with most lasting just about 1 hour. Discussions were tape recorded with the respondent's permission.

Once the discussion leaders had completed their summaries, the tapes were sent out for transcription. Verbatim transcripts were produced for 62 of the 64 discussions. In two cases, the tape recorders malfunctioned, producing blank tapes; fortunately, the discussion summaries provided enough detail that the gist of what the respondent said was preserved.

Two senior staff members (including the task manager) jointly analyzed the data according to commonly accepted principles of qualitative analysis (c.f., Miles and Huberman, 1994; Berkowitz, 1997). The discussion summaries provided an initial stepping-off point, suggesting some general themes across the discussions. Most of the analysis involved a close and comprehensive reading and re-reading of the transcripts to detect and confirm common themes and patterns both within and across respondent groups. The analysts began reading through the transcripts once a “critical mass” of perhaps one-third to one-half of the transcripts had been completed. It also helped that both analysts had also served as discussion leaders, who between them led nearly half of the discussions. After reading through the transcripts several times, the analysts met to discuss initial themes and patterns in the data. These were reviewed with other senior project staff, and a preliminary outline developed for the report. Then the analysts divided up the work of fleshing out the analytic themes and writing up the report, although still working closely to ensure a close fit between the pieces.

1.4 Organization of This Report

Chapter 2 presents the findings from the discussions with representatives of the national organizations. Chapter 3 covers those from the discussions with State Prevention Coordinators. Chapter 4 presents a summary and conclusions, including respondents’ ideas on how the Media Campaign could help to advance their priorities for the field of substance abuse prevention.

References

- Berkowitz, S. (1996). Using Qualitative and Mixed Method Approaches. In R. Riviere, S. Berkowitz, C. Carter, and C. Graves-Ferguson (Eds.), *Needs Assessment: A Creative and Practical Guide for Social Scientists* (pp. 53-70). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis Publishers.
- Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berkowitz, S. (1997). Analyzing Qualitative Data. In J. Frechtling and L. Sharp. (Eds.). *User-Friendly Handbook for Mixed Method Evaluations* (pp. 4-1 – 4-19). Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

2. National Organizations' Views of and Relationships with the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign

Telephone discussions were carried out with representatives of 12 national organizations. After exploring their organization's prevention-related activities, the Westat team questioned the respondents about their knowledge of, relationships with, and impressions of the ONDCP Media Campaign. They were asked to say what they knew about the Media Campaign and how they had first learned about and/or become involved with it. They were queried as to their views of the Media Campaign ads and the fit between the Media Campaign's messages and those they are trying to convey in their own prevention efforts. They also were asked about their relationship with the Media Campaign to date and whether and how it had contributed to their substance abuse prevention work, as well as what relationship they expect, or would like, with the Media Campaign over the next 2 years. Finally, they talked about their priorities for the substance abuse prevention field in the next 2 years and what the Media Campaign might do to help them promote these priorities; this latter issue will be touched on below, but covered in greater depth and detail in Chapter 4.

It should be recalled, as stated in Chapter 1, that partnering with these (and other) national organizations is a part of the Media Campaign's outreach strategy for reaching community groups. In addition, it should be emphasized, once again, that the views expressed herein are those of the respondents.

2.1 Overview of Findings for National Organizations

This section briefly summarizes the national organization representatives' views of the Media Campaign.

- Respondents generally liked the Media Campaign ads, which they saw as broadly consistent with the "healthy lifestyle," positive youth development, and "talk to your kids" messages they are trying to promote in their own prevention efforts. The parent ads had special appeal, particularly the one showing young people telling their parents they were "always in their face" and checking up on them, then thanking them in the end. A few respondents also commented positively on the "style" and "look" of the ads.
- Most respondents felt the Campaign brings the issue of youth substance abuse onto the public's "radar screen" in a memorable and effective way. Several argued that the Campaign plays such an important role as a counterweight to the pro-drug messages communicated in the media that it should continue indefinitely.
- Responses were more varied and qualified when it came to knowledge and views of the Campaign as an organizational partner, as well as views of whether and how the Campaign had contributed in any way to an organization's own substance abuse prevention efforts.

- Representatives of the two organizations that focus specifically on substance-abuse-related issues were most knowledgeable about and “intertwined” with the Media Campaign. Although highly supportive of its goals and message, they did not feel the Media Campaign per se has really contributed to their work in prevention. They also felt that not enough had been done to buttress and reinforce existing efforts at the state and community level.
- The representatives of the 10 national youth-serving and parent-serving organizations not focused on substance abuse can be arrayed on a continuum with respect to their knowledge, views of, and interactions with the Media Campaign.
 - Two organizations, one youth service-oriented and the other parent education-focused, were highly enthusiastic about the Media Campaign, their working relationship with it, and its influence on their efforts in substance abuse prevention. They looked forward to even closer collaboration in the future.
 - Two other major youth service organizations, both with well-developed substance abuse prevention programs of their own, were generally supportive of the Campaign and had collaborated with the Campaign in the past. However, they reported that contact had lapsed at some point over the past 6 months to a year. The resulting decline in communications had left the status of ongoing collaborative efforts, as well as future relationships, uncertain. Another organizational representative also voiced concern over a decline in communications.
 - Four of the organizations did not consider substance abuse prevention a current high priority among policy concerns. Three of these are youth service organizations that stress the importance of healthy lifestyles for youth, and do not focus on substance abuse per se. Their representatives knew little about the Campaign or how to connect with it, should they so desire. The fourth organization, devoted to parent education, is involved with the Campaign despite not viewing substance abuse prevention as a priority. This happened because the Campaign took the initiative in forming the partnership.
 - The remaining two organizations did not consider substance abuse prevention a current high priority and had not been actively approached by the Media Campaign. These respondents knew relatively little about the Media Campaign, apart from what they saw on television, and their organizations maintained an “on-paper only” relationship with it. However, there was some suggestion that they would be open for active partnering if the Campaign were to take the initiative and provide the incentive.

2.2 Substance Abuse-Focused Organizations’ Reactions to the Media Campaign

Two of the national organizations represent constituencies in the substance abuse prevention and treatment arena. One represents state-level substance abuse prevention and treatment professionals and convenes the National Prevention Network, an organization of state alcohol and other drug abuse prevention representatives whose mission is to provide support to and enhance prevention efforts. The other is an advocate and constituency organization for local community anti-drug coalitions. Since these two organizations are explicitly substance abuse focused and advocate for substance-abuse-related issues and legislation on the Hill, they appear to be different enough from the other 10 national organizations contacted in role and expected relationship to the Media Campaign to warrant discussing them separately.

Representatives of these substance-abuse-focused organizations were extremely supportive of the concept and messages of the Media Campaign. Both organizations would like to see it continue, and have advocated for its continuation with the Congress. One respondent expressed the view that the Campaign is the only real counterbalance to pervasive pro-drug messages in the media, including expressions of support for medical marijuana laws. This respondent added that, in her personal experience, the Campaign has drawn enough attention to the subject to make kids and drugs no longer a taboo topic for discussion at dinner parties of middle-class parents. Respondents representing these organizations seemed to feel that the Media Campaign has successfully heightened awareness of the issues among adults, raising the visibility of youth substance abuse as an issue on the public's "radar screen."

Moreover, since youthful substance abuse is not likely to disappear, representatives of these organizations argued that the Media Campaign needs to continue, because its anti-drug messages require constant reinforcement. As one respondent put it, "Americans are notorious for their short-term memory. We tend to forget, especially things that deal with prevention. The Media Campaign...is something that has to be broadcast over and over and over again. You never quite...win the war. You've got to fight the battles month after month, year after year."

At the same time, as prevention professionals, these representatives of substance-abuse-focused organizations raised some serious concerns about what they perceived to be an absence of follow-through and a dearth of local connections that can make the messages more meaningful and sustainable in a real-life way. One respondent noted that the Campaign has heightened awareness of the issues without providing concomitant access to specific information about how to get involved and exactly how to talk about drugs with your kids. Another noted, "It's (just) ads. We need more on how." This respondent stressed the need for follow through with programming as well as consideration of environmental factors, since individual behavior change models are not enough. The Campaign, as this respondent pithily put it, "needs legs."

Along similar lines, the respondents representing the community coalitions stressed that Campaign ads alone, however powerful and on target, cannot "do it." In the absence of sustainable linkages to local communities, the ads in and of themselves cannot reasonably be expected to effect major changes in attitudes and behaviors. The Campaign (or someone) needs to do more to ensure that these local connections are made, and in the process, to help build what is admittedly in many places an inadequate and still nascent prevention infrastructure. While acknowledging this may not be the Campaign's "job," these respondents agreed it is essential that these connections be forged on the local level for the Campaign to have its desired effects.

With respect to the reach and content of the Campaign messages, these respondents echoed a sentiment also widely expressed by the State Prevention Coordinators, that the power of the Media Campaign has been diluted by its having excluded alcohol. One respondent noted "it (the Campaign) needs to include alcohol." Another said, "I would characterize the (Campaign's) role as being one that's very central and as far as I know the predominant drug abuse campaign in this nation, and it's a pity that it didn't—wasn't allowed to include...underage alcohol." Substance abuse prevention specialists tend to view underage drinking as "of a piece" with, and often as a gateway to, illicit drug use among youth. Thus, while recognizing the legislative constraints on the paid advertising, they believe that it was a mistake to exclude alcohol, or more specifically, underage drinking, from the Media Campaign.

Not surprisingly, representatives of both these substance-abuse-focused organizations were knowledgeable about and involved in the Campaign from the very start, and continue to support it in various ways in their activities with their respective constituencies as well as their work on Capitol Hill. One of the respondents recalls attending a meeting convened by ONDCP to “try out” the idea of a major paid national anti-drug media campaign just prior to the Campaign’s actual inception. She reported that the reaction at that meeting was very mixed, but once it was announced as a fait accompli, everyone rallied around the cause. Both organizations provide strong advocacy support for the Campaign on the Hill.

One of these organizations helped to organize the downlink of former President Clinton’s launch of the Campaign from Atlanta. The other of these substance-abuse-focused organizations had a subcontract with the Media Campaign from December 1999 to December 2000, and at the time of the discussion (early October 2001) was in the process of finalizing a second subcontract for a briefer period. The first effort, carried out in conjunction with the Academy for Educational Development (AED), entailed helping to set up and facilitate local review panels for PSA spots on radio and television, as part of the local pro bono match program that has since been discontinued. Their responsibility was to designate someone from the state office or a substate office to “be at the table” and help facilitate the process. The second subcontract will involve providing feedback to ONDCP on the accuracy of the contact information provided on Media Campaign ads appearing in the print media in selected markets. This will be accomplished by a telephone survey.

In addition, both organizations disseminate Campaign materials to their respective memberships: to representatives of the National Prevention Network in the states, and to local coalition leaders. However, the representative of the organization representing states noted that most of what they disseminate consists of heads-up memos, public policy updates, grant application deadlines, and the like. The organization that represents local anti-drug coalitions does more in the way of direct programming, but this may bypass the state level. Both organizations also sponsor annual meetings in which the members and other participants may be briefed on various topics, including the Media Campaign.

When asked if the Media Campaign had in any way affected their organization’s prevention work in the past 2 years, representatives of the organization representing local coalitions reported no basic change in how they do their job. However, the individual who works most closely with local coalitions did feel that the campaign may have affected her work, in combination with other Federal efforts stimulating local interest in prevention, such as the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP)’s State Incentive Grants.³ More specifically, she felt that greater focus on prevention might be the reason why their organization had been getting more requests to provide training and technical assistance in prevention programming and coalition-building to local coalitions.

Representatives of both substance-abuse-focused organizations were overall very positive about the Campaign, anticipating that their strong relationships to it will continue for the duration, and expressing a willingness to work with ONDCP to make the Media Campaign even better in the years remaining. In the best of all possible worlds, they would like to see the Campaign continue indefinitely, as a way of continuing to keep the issue of youth substance abuse on the radar screen.

³ The State Incentive Grants (SIG) are designed to support creation of a coordinated, statewide infrastructure for delivering prevention services and the diffusion of science-based prevention efforts. They are described more fully in Chapter 3.

2.3 Youth-Development and Parent-Service Organizations' Reactions to the Media Campaign

Of the remaining 10 organizations contacted, 8 are national organizations devoted to serving youth and/or parents (Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of America, Boys and Girls Clubs, Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association, National Parent and Teachers Association, Parenting Coalition International, and the Future Farmers of America) with local chapters or affiliates throughout the country. Two (The League of Latin American Citizens and the National Urban League) are national organizations representing minority ethnic and racial (Latino and African-American) constituencies. All were on a list of national organizations partnering with the Media Campaign. In short, the goal was to speak with representatives of national organizations with some connection to the Campaign that have infrastructures allowing them to reach into local communities. Furthermore, these organizations are not specifically or exclusively focused on substance-abuse-related issues, and might or might not consider substance abuse prevention as a priority in their work with youth and parents.

As it turns out, these organizations fall along a rough continuum from those with high knowledge of, support for, and close working relationships with the Media Campaign, to those with nominal knowledge of the Campaign and an "on-paper only" relationship. Most fall somewhere in between these two poles. Where a given organization falls along this continuum appears to be a function of several factors. These include timing; the fit between the Campaign and the organization's own internal needs and exigencies at the time the connection was made; philosophical and stylistic fit with the Campaign; presence of specific people as "connectors"; and whether there was a perception of mutual benefit in the relationship.

2.3.1 The Two Organizations Most Positive About and Involved with the Media Campaign

The two organizations whose spokespersons were most enthusiastic about both Campaign materials and their mutual organizational collaboration with the Campaign—one a major youth serving organization, the other a parent-focused group—noted several things as important.

First, both expressed an appreciation for the technical quality, the look and feel of the ads and other Campaign materials, quite apart from the messages they are trying to convey. They liked both style and substance. The youth service organization representative, who works closely with youth, spoke enthusiastically on the subject. She likes the nondidactic feel of the ads and the fact that the message of the "anti-drug" is positive. She also feels that the Campaign is sensitive to the nuances of youth culture, recognizing there is no one uniform youth culture that applies to all age groups, races, ethnic groups, and regions of the country.

I really like the fact that ONDCP is doing this Campaign. I think it keeps drugs as a priority (in an otherwise fickle media environment). And I think the fact that they're doing it in a different way is important—like a lot of my kids are like, "Oh, yeah, that was a cool commercial."

When she conducted focus groups with preteen and teenage girls on selected Campaign ads, they "felt like someone was finally telling the truth." The ads were "speaking their language." She notes, "As

adults we get so stuck in the details of it that we forget it's the delivery that's almost more important. And I think the Campaign commercials focus on delivery."

Both of these organizational representatives (one of whom has a background in marketing) feel the Campaign has gotten the message that the "good guys" need to use the same marketing techniques employed by other advertisers trying to sell things to kids. They've learned to fight fire with fire, so to speak. In this sense, they feel an ideological and "stylistic" kinship with the whole notion of a media campaign.

Second, representatives of these two organizations highly favorable to and involved with the Campaign both perceive that they were approached by ONDCP in a collegial way, at a propitious time, and with the focus on a mutually beneficial collaboration. The founder of the parenting group, a relatively new organization of parenting professionals, reports that she was approached to sit on the Campaign Steering Committee and found it a perfect way "not to have to reinvent the wheel." Just starting to get into the substance abuse prevention arena, with a message that paralleled the Campaign's focus on talking to your kids about drugs, the prospect of a mutually beneficial connection could not have been better timed.

We're always looking for solid programs where we don't have to reinvent the wheel and that they (coordinators across the country) can use as tools to get information out to families and parents. And the fact that there's so much, that the press releases are pretty much done for us, and that the posters and all the literature that you use is there and it's free. We like tying into the information and saying, "Here this is another tool that you can use."

This information can then be filtered down to parents and families, and that "ties in with our vision of getting...parents to have access."

The youth service organization representative reported that ONDCP approached them in a refreshingly "ungovernmental" way: rather than telling them what they (ONDCP) wanted, they asked the group what they needed.

They came to us. They called us up and said, "We want to work with you guys." We sat down at a meeting and they basically said, "What can we do for you?" And we looked at them like they were nuts. They said, "Well, this is our mission. What do you need?" And we looked at them again like they were nuts because most people come up, "We want to do a patch program, we want to do this and we want to do that," and they try to get us to do what they want to do. They (ONDCP) came to us and said, "These are our goals and our missions. What can we do to help that might get messages across and stay within the integrity of your program?"

It is also noteworthy that this individual was new to the organization at the time these initial contacts were made. As in the case of the parenting organization described above, there was no history, nor entrenched interests to stand in the way.

This initial encounter grew into an ongoing, mutually beneficial working relationship between this national youth service organization and the Media Campaign. The two are partners in the development of a book in an issue series. Primarily addressing substance abuse, the book also brings in other related themes and issues and, perhaps most importantly, "looks just like a teen magazine."

With style as important as substance, they are trying to give it a “contemporary” and “edgy” feel while still appealing to the “middle of the road.” The Campaign is helping to pay for the design and printing of the book as part of the program match. When the book is completed, the Campaign may also make it possible to distribute the books to a wider audience than the organization’s membership alone. While our respondent predicted that some local chapters “will eat it up,” others may not. Local chapters are under no necessary obligation to use the book or any other materials produced by the national organization.

The other major collaborative venture between this organization and the Media Campaign is a new program in which girls ages 8 to 11 years can earn a badge that involves completing activities related to learning about substance abuse. This has the potential to reach over 700,000 girls in this age group nationally.

Clearly, their relationship to the Media Campaign has directly influenced the programmatic activities of both these organizations. As the parenting group representative put it, their timely connection to the Media Campaign has expanded their involvement in parenting issues related to substance abuse. Similarly, the youth service organization has embarked on several new substance abuse prevention projects in collaboration with the Media Campaign, who, from their perspective, has been a “fantasy collaborator” because they are able to get things done quickly.

Not surprisingly, then, both these highly engaged organizations are highly supportive of the Media Campaign and would like to see stronger collaborations in the future. The youth service organization would like to do even more with the Media Campaign, including movement into new media via a satellite link broadcast from which videos could be made for distribution to local chapters nationwide. The parenting organization, too, would like to strengthen the tie by using the Media Campaign to bring about a “true” working partnership between professionals in the parenting and substance abuse prevention fields. Their only quibble with the Campaign is that it would be nice to give local organizations that distribute Campaign materials a “plug” by including local contact information. She has suggested that they make stickers with this information to put onto the materials.

2.3.2 Organizations Involved with the Campaign, but with Concerns about the Continuity of the Relationship

Next on the continuum are two organizations that, while generally supportive of the Campaign, have reservations about the nature and continuity of their organizational relationships with the Campaign. Interestingly, at the time of their first interactions with the Campaign, these two well-known national youth service organizations already had well-developed substance abuse prevention programs of their own and a well-defined “values oriented” stance toward prevention. Already being “established” in their thinking and programming may have made it more difficult to forge a strong collaboration with the Media Campaign. At the same time, at some point the Media Campaign clearly failed to keep up these linkages in an ongoing way, as this concern is expressed by other organizations, as well, including some that say they would have welcomed use of Campaign materials in their programming.

The representative of one of these two youth service organizations was extremely positive in her assessment of the messages in the Campaign ads. The Media Campaign, in her view, has “helped tremendously” to bring substance abuse into the public consciousness. Moreover, the kids in the clubs “loved the ads” and the anti-drug message is consistent with their organization’s general youth development approach, which stresses the importance of engaging kids in alternative activities.

At the same time, the local chapters have their own, well-articulated substance abuse prevention program, geared to different ages, from 6-year-olds to those 16 and older. The program has been around for about 15 years and is constantly being updated, as needed. The basic idea is to promote abstinence by building refusal and resistance skills. One component of the program has been designated a model program by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP). The overall program is the “number one most requested program across the country” by local affiliates, of which there are 2,000 across the country and on military bases, representing over 3 million young people.

Thus, while the Media Campaign’s “What is your anti-drug?” is a nice message that is broadly consistent with the general philosophy of the organization, it would never become central or supplant this core program. Accordingly, our respondent reports that the Campaign has had little effect on their basic program, which “has pretty much stayed intact. Just like with anything else, if something really good came across, we would use that in addition to but not in place of what we’re doing.” As to what effect the Media Campaign may have had at the local level, “I’m sure some of those great posters are on the wall in the clubs.”

This youth service organization’s relationship with the Media Campaign was strong at first. They sat on the Steering Committee and disseminated information about the Campaign to all the clubs, actively engaging them in the “What Is Your Anti-Drug?” effort. This is a multimedia initiative aimed at youth ages 11 to 17 begun in the fall of 2000. Youth were asked to answer the question “What’s your anti-drug?” and encouraged to submit ideas to ONDCP by post, email, or by the Web. Describing their organization’s positive relationship with the Campaign during this period, our respondent noted, “There was a young woman who was involved ...she was hired as a consultant and she did a phenomenal job of bringing us in, bringing us all to the table and just looking at how we were going to disseminate this information. This wouldn’t be one where I’d say, ‘Well, you know, it really didn’t work.’ It was a relationship and it served our clubs well.”

However, the relationship has since lapsed, leaving the status of a video created as part of the pro bono match program up in the air. “I don’t know that it was actually approved—again, because while we were working to define and I think to enhance that, General McCaffrey stepped down.” Since then, they have heard nothing more about the video, which showed kids role playing various ways of resisting drugs. Our respondent indicated a strong desire to resume a working relationship with the Campaign as soon as possible.

The other youth service organization that fits into this second category has many features in common with the latter, including a “healthy youth development,” strongly values-oriented message, and a well-established substance abuse prevention initiative originally developed in 1987 with the encouragement of the first Director of ONDCP. According to our respondents, all local chapters use these materials, which are disseminated to them by the Drug Abuse Task Force. The materials, geared for presentation to different age groups from first grade through high school, show various parts of the body and what different drugs can do to them. They are periodically updated with new information—for example, on new drugs—but the basic thrust has remained the same over time. The “meta-message” is that no amount of drug taking, smoking, or drinking is acceptable. This fits with the larger “healthy activity” position: “We hope to keep them (youth) fully occupied in setting their goals and achievements to do things that will turn them on mentally, not needing the additives that drugs represent.”

In putting together this program nearly 15 year ago, the organization found it relatively easy to get help obtaining up-to-date information from government agencies. However, they found it difficult to

engage them as co-sponsors, particularly since government agencies were “willing to go out on a limb” when it came to drugs, but not alcohol or tobacco, which are keystones of this organization’s approach to substance abuse prevention. They got help from private organizations and dipped into their own coffers “to the tune of about a quarter of a million dollars.” Since then, they have designed the program to pay for itself, selling the brochures and associated teachers guides on a cost basis to local councils and “anybody else who wants to buy it.” They estimate that more than 17 million copies of these materials have reached youth ages 7 to 17.

The relevance of this is twofold. First, this organization has created a well-established, “well oiled” substance abuse prevention effort that reflects a very definite perspective on the issue. This may make them less amenable to interorganizational collaboration or use or sharing of other materials, including Media Campaign materials. Moreover, their original, somewhat ambivalent experience in working with government agencies may also have colored their perceptions of and receptivity to the Media Campaign from the start.

In this light, the organizational representatives’ description of how they first became aware of and connected with the Media Campaign could not be more different from that of the youth service organization described in the most positive category above. “I’m wired. I’ve been in this (substance abuse prevention) too long not to find something useful for us and then try to utilize it. But they (Media Campaign folks) also come to us and say, ‘We want you to do this.’ We say, ‘Well, that’s not quite how we need to operate,’ and we will try to direct them in ways that will be useful for them or us.” One gets the impression of mutual wrangling, in which each organization is trying to impose “its way” on the other, rather than the kind of mutually beneficial give-and-take described by the other representative. How much of the difference is purely perception is hard to know.

Accordingly, the representatives of this organization expressed a certain “pique” and sensitivity to being taken advantage of in certain respects in their relationships with other organizations, including the Media Campaign.

If it (something from another organization) is relevant to our (name of substance abuse prevention) program, and reinforces our position in councils, we will channel it through this office...But we are not a dispensation source here. We are not a top of a funnel that everybody can throw their material into and every...executive is going to hand it out to every kid, of which there are 5 million. We have a time schedule in which we will continue to reinforce the issues of drug awareness and we make sure that ours is the lead program and there is other information they can get to support these issues if they’re interested.

He went on to complain that “People look to us as—this is a great way. Let’s give it to the (name of organization) and they’ll do it all by themselves,” when, in fact, such efforts require expenditure of resources and volunteer hours. He pointed out, as well, that other organizations are using this organization’s material and “we don’t funnel their material into our universe because we’ve got it here.” There are all kinds of good materials out there, but their own are “very comprehensive,” and a consistent source of income. “We’re selling about 10,000 to 15,000 of these a month still. It’s very steady. It gets wide distribution.” Clearly, this organization is strongly invested in protecting and promoting their own substance abuse prevention efforts and wants to control how other related materials are “funneled” to their local constituents.

Given this general stance, it is not surprising that this organization's representatives should take a somewhat guarded position on the Campaign. The relationship to date has disappointed them in much the same way as their initial efforts at working with the government agencies in the 1980s. "We've had a...difficult time in the last couple of years with what they called a soft match." As part of the match agreement, the respondent reported that their organization did a cover story on drug abuse in the June 2000 issue of their magazine and anticipated receiving the match in hard advertising dollars but "then the soft match disappeared! I don't know where it went, but it wasn't relevant anymore...after we had gone out on a limb." While they have salvaged the effort and "don't feel that badly about it," this has left a sour taste in their mouth.⁴

A more positive collaboration with the Media Campaign involved bringing the "What is your anti-drug?" theme into activities at a major event held in the summer of 2001. The main focus was their own substance abuse awareness and prevention program, but they thought, "Gee, the ONDCP has these programs that it might be good for us to help support." So they had kids sign a board and write down their anti-drug, which yielded maybe 15,000 signatures. They also distributed materials provided by the Media Campaign at this event. It is noteworthy here that the main focus of the event was the organization's own program and the "What is your anti-drug?" was perceived as a nice add-on" favor" to the ONDCP.

Despite prior negative experiences and misgivings about the Media Campaign—which they believe has organizational problems and is more interested in working with organizations that do not have their own drug awareness programs—this major youth service organization would like to maintain a connection. At some level, the interaction has been useful in terms of information sharing and making helpful contacts. They used to meet with Media Campaign folks at least twice a year, and "I'm very comfortable with the kinds of input they can provide and very interested to see what they do." However, the relationship has lapsed of late: "I guess I haven't been in touch for awhile. Have we got a new Drug Czar?" Like several other respondents, these are waiting to see how the next phase in their relationship to the Media Campaign will unfold.

The foregoing discussion suggests that timing, mutual perception, ideological "fit," and the organization's own exigencies and needs, particularly as they relate to substance abuse programming, all appear to figure into the "mix" in influencing reactions to and establishment of relationships with the Media Campaign. Moreover, it also suggests that for both these organizations, the relationship with the Campaign has lapsed in the past 6 months to a year. These points, as well as others, are reinforced in reviewing our discussions with other youth service organizations.

2.3.3 Organizations Less Involved with the Campaign

The organizations in the third cluster are less involved with the Campaign than those described in the first two categories. One was briefly involved in a project with the Campaign; the other is currently engaged in a collaborative effort with the Media Campaign. Three of the four represent youth service organizations that share a perspective (not unlike that of the two organizations described immediately above) that defines prevention as "any positive activity" and view youth development as an integrated set of issues that includes substance abuse among a host of others. Thus, they are less inclined to isolate substance abuse as a problem or to focus specifically or exclusively on substance abuse

⁴ This organization apparently got "caught" in the decision to exclude feature articles from eligibility for pro bono match credit effective as of June 30, 2001. Please see Chapter 1 for more on this.

prevention. This is seen as a matter of promoting positive lifestyles and not dwelling on negatives of what *not* to do.

Said one organizational representative:

I think what is appropriate is if we focused on giving kids options and opportunities for constructive use of time, and we help them understand their self worth, their value, and their contributions. That should be the priority that leads to addressing all those other issues, whether it is drug use or teen pregnancy...All our programs are preventative in nature, whether it is youth forage camping or childcare after school.

This stance does not preclude a focus on drug abuse among a range of issues, especially if this is couched in the “healthy lifestyles” idiom and is considered a priority by local affiliates. This respondent’s organization does do some drug prevention and drug awareness programming. However, this stance probably does make such programming less likely. Another of these organizations has gone one step further with an explicit policy not to talk about drugs. “Well, what we try to do is we don’t talk about ‘don’t take drugs, don’t do this, don’t do that.’ What we try to do is talk about healthy lifestyles, establish your values, establish your circle of influence, your friends, and all that...What we do is try to build the inner person, so he or she won’t have to take drugs to feel good.”

When coupled with an organizational structure in which local chapters play a strong role in setting policy priorities and/or other priorities dominate, the net result is that substance abuse prevention does not occupy a high position on the “totem pole” of issues for any of these four organizations. Right now, one of these organizations is focusing on more gender-specific issues such as pregnancy prevention, childcare, and violence against women. Were drug use to be woven in, they would like to see linkages to issues such as dating violence. Another of these organizations is preoccupied with the teacher shortage in rural areas, since teachers deliver their programs in a school setting. A third ranks school violence and sex education as its highest priorities.

Under these circumstances, a strong internal impetus to link up with the Campaign is lacking. Thus, three of these respondents knew very little about the Media Campaign or how to link up with it should they want to, and much of what they did know seemed to come from their role as “ordinary citizens” rather than their place in their respective organizations.

Said one of the respondents representing a national youth service organization that does not currently consider substance abuse prevention a high priority, “I have been aware of the Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, so I think that is very visible in a public service way.” She likes the messages the ads convey and feels they are consistent with her organization’s basic philosophy. She became aware of the Media Campaign through attendance at meetings of the Prevention Through Service Alliance, an association of organizations that stress the preventive effects of performing community service. If a local association were to express an interest in substance abuse prevention, she would be able to link them to information from the Media Campaign web site. But if things were to change in such a way as to make substance abuse prevention a priority at the national level of the organization, she would have “no idea” what the possibilities for future collaboration with the Media Campaign might be.

For his part, another youth service organization representative with whom we spoke realized only after being prompted by the discussion leader that the ad he liked so much was a Media Campaign ad.

"The one ad I saw and I don't know if this is from them, I can't remember exactly, is where your kids talk about you were this, you were that, you went into my private room." When told this is indeed a Media Campaign ad, he waxed enthusiastic: "My goodness, great ad. I love the ad. If that's the Campaign that makes parents aware of what their kids are doing, I love it, that's a great ad!" This individual had first heard about the Media Campaign from a telephone call he got about 2 years before from someone whose name now escaped him. He admitted to not knowing much about the Media Campaign's goals and messages, and when read a brief statement describing the Media Campaign, was full of questions about the "value-added" beyond the ads themselves: "See, that's what I haven't got. We've got a ton of educational material that we already provide so what is it going to do beyond a media campaign, that I don't understand. How are they going to help civic groups and faith-based organizations? To do what? Give out materials is that what they do?"

The representative of another youth service organization stressing healthy lifestyles also had a difficult time identifying which were Media Campaign ads, despite having been briefly involved in a project with the Media Campaign. This respondent could make the connection only through specific individuals with whom he had worked. He liked the ads: "The messages are pretty informative and they really hit home." But if the media presence of the Media Campaign remains strong in his part of the country, the same cannot be said for their organizational relationship to the Media Campaign. In the beginning, a member of their communications team initiated contact with the Media Campaign. They put together a cross-team effort and applied for and won a \$10,000 local match grant to create a "Healthy Lifestyles" poster. The person who was their organization's original point of connection to the Media Campaign, however, has since left, and ever since then the relationship between the two organizations can best be described as "hit or miss." "We were hitting the healthy lifestyle pretty strong, and we actually had workshops on healthy lifestyles and had people from ONDCP...come in and do workshops and talk about drug prevention." Since then, the Media Campaign has "backed off" and most communications are through email.

From his perspective, the Media Campaign's efforts to connect with organizations to try to "pinpoint or deliver some type of message" have slowed considerably. He would welcome reconnecting with the Media Campaign and getting organizational support of the type initially offered to his predecessor, who attended meetings in Washington, D.C. where key people were brought in to talk about how to energize the connections, "That would be real important for us, too. Because we're a nonprofit and we are always looking for help when it comes to funding if they want us to do stuff like that (e.g., the Healthy Lifestyles poster)." Moreover, despite an organizational stance on not focusing on drugs explicitly, they would be "delighted" to have Media Campaign materials to distribute to their constituency or use in their training sessions with teachers.

The above example reinforces several of the respondents' perceptions that some time in the course of the past year, the Media Campaign had stopped putting much effort into sustaining relationships with (at least some of) its national partners. This appears to be associated, in turn, with their uncertainty regarding the status of the pro bono match program, which was an important "hook" motivating partnership in the Media Campaign.⁵ In addition, this example suggests the importance of specific individuals as "linkage agents" between organizations.

⁵ As seen in Chapter 1, the pro bono match program did undergo changes during the second half of 2001. The Campaign's apparent failure to communicate the specific nature of these changes in timely fashion caused considerable confusion and uncertainty regarding the future status of the entire pro bono match program for many respondents.

The one parent-oriented organization in this cluster is the exception that proves the rule. Although they do maintain and periodically update a web site that includes information on how to talk with your kids about drugs, right now, school violence and sex education trump substance abuse prevention as major issues for this parent-focused organization. In part, priorities are set by the membership and in part by “opportunities.” It was only because they were approached by the Media Campaign that this organization got involved. Meetings took place in which mutual interests were explored, and then the possibility of collaboration was taken back to this organization’s Executive Committee to see if there was an appropriate fit in goals and objectives. They agreed, especially liking the “parenting piece”—“what are parents doing, increasing talk...all that other good stuff.” Several months later they received a letter from the Media Campaign “saying yes, we want to work with you, and these are some of the things we want to do.”

The primary project involves disseminating a “keeping your kids drug free” tool kit to this organization’s members nationwide. The Media Campaign is developing the kit, which will bear this well-known organization’s logo. The respondent was unsure of the exact timeline for the project, but believed, as of the time of the discussion (mid-October 2001), that the brochures had been produced and it was a matter of getting government approval. She was also unsure as to exactly how the dissemination process would work, but was confident that it would reach a large audience. They will also have a link to the Media Campaign on their web site as well as a banner “announcing” this as a new resource in partnership with ONDCP. At this point, the respondent remained unsure as to whether this project is a one-time thing or would spawn additional collaborations in the future.

2.3.4 Organizations Least Involved with the Campaign

The above example from a major national parent-oriented organization suggests it is possible to enlist participation from an organization that does not currently consider substance abuse prevention as a major priority, if a focused effort is made and framed in a manner that appeals to the organization’s own goals and philosophies. Both racial and ethnic constituency organizations we contacted are examples of organizations with other priorities where no such approach had been made, resulting in no real connection to the Media Campaign. Immigration is the big issue on the table for one organization, reducing the educational achievement gap between minority and other students is the other organization’s central concern. Thus, while the representative of one of these organizations is supportive of the Media Campaign and was quite taken with the ads she had seen, especially the “talk to your kid” ads for parents—the organizational relationship is “on paper” only. The same is true of the other organization, although the possibility that a connection might be made was suggested by their involvement in a project on AIDS in partnership with another government agency. The respondent reported that although they have “way too many issues to work on,” the other agency had contacted them, and since the other agency was willing to take the initiative, their organization was happy to participate.

2.4 Conclusions

Many factors were at work influencing these respondents’ knowledge and perceptions of the Media Campaign, their degree of involvement with it, and its perceived contributions to their own substance-abuse-related activities to date. Even the most knowledgeable respondents often lacked crucial pieces of information about the Campaign, its goals, and activities.

Not surprisingly, respondents representing the two substance abuse-focused organizations were knowledgeable about and interconnected with the Media Campaign. They had worked to support the Media Campaign on the Hill and to disseminate information about it to their respective constituencies. However, these representatives did not believe the Media Campaign had really affected their approach to their work in substance abuse prevention, and also expressed misgivings about the degree to which the Media Campaign had successfully penetrated local community networks.

The remaining 10 national organizations' knowledge, perceptions, and assessments of working relationships with the Media Campaign fall along a continuum as affected by a complex of factors. As seen, these include timing, the fit between the organization's and the Media Campaign's goals and agendas with respect to substance abuse prevention at the time the contact was established, respondents' perceptions of how Media Campaign representatives presented the proposed relationship to potential partners, and philosophical and stylistic fit between the Media Campaign and these organizations. Admittedly, not all these factors are potentially subject to influence by Media Campaign actions. For example, the Media Campaign does not have much to say about the internal priorities of different organizations. Matters of timing are also a two-way street: the Media Campaign has its own timetable, which may or may not fit with a given organization's internal timetable of readiness for collaboration. Nevertheless, our respondents have some recommendations to make about ways the Media Campaign might, if it so chose, adapt or differentiate its strategy in partnering with national organizations over the course of the next 2 years. These are discussed in Chapter 4.

3. Impact of the Media Campaign on State Prevention Activities

3.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 1, the Media Campaign aims to reduce youth substance use through the application of social marketing strategies. The ads and messages are designed to encourage young people to develop healthy lifestyle alternatives to drug use (“the anti-drug”) and to encourage parents to engage in more parent-child communications. In addition, through its partnering strategy with national organizations, the Media Campaign aims to buttress and reinforce substance abuse prevention programs supported by local communities. Discussions with representatives of several national organizations provide some evidence (see Chapter 2) of the extent to which their partnerships with the Media Campaign affected local efforts.

Additionally, although there was never an explicit strategy to involve State Prevention Coordinators directly in Campaign endeavors, there was still an interest in discovering what—if any—relationships might emerge between Campaign activities and state and local prevention efforts. The Westat team conducted discussions with the Prevention Coordinators from all 50 states and the District of Columbia (see discussion guide, Appendix A). Prevention Coordinators generally held administrative (rather than programming) positions in their states, and represented a wide range of departments, including Substance Abuse, Child and Family Services, Behavioral Health, and Juvenile Corrections. In most cases, they represented their state in the National Prevention Network, and were responsible for allocating Federal Block Grant monies or other resources to local entities. Because of their statewide administrative responsibilities and perspectives, these 51 individuals would likely be able to describe a national overview of prevention activities. In addition, they could share their perceptions of and reactions to the Media Campaign’s ads and messages, and any relationship they perceived between the Media Campaign and prevention efforts in their jurisdictions.

3.2 Overview of Findings from State Prevention Coordinators

A review of transcripts with State Coordinators indicated that respondents generally described their state prevention efforts in terms of unmet need, such as insufficient funding, a still-developing prevention infrastructure and workforce, and a need to validate and reinforce the effectiveness of prevention science. In describing these areas, respondents offered insights into how a national media campaign might effectively build upon and contribute to local prevention efforts, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

When respondents were directly asked their perspective on the Media Campaign, the vast majority of them were very positive about the ads and messages, although few reported any direct or ongoing relationship to Campaign activities. Those representatives who reported the greatest impact from the Media Campaign were all from states in which a major metropolitan area had been a site in Phase I of the Media Campaign. Although not all states with Phase I sites reported such a clear Campaign

influence, the finding does suggest that a state's participation in this early rollout phase of the Media Campaign sometimes had positive long-term effects.

Another significant finding from the discussions with State Prevention Coordinators is that substance abuse prevention is a still-developing component of most state's public health endeavors. As a consequence, they suggested, the Media Campaign might be struggling to locate potential points of leverage within some states, since those points are still in the process of being established. Respondents noted that over the next 2 years, the Media Campaign might find a stronger foothold in many jurisdictions as these state infrastructures become more fully developed.

One impetus for the development of statewide prevention infrastructures was a state's receipt of a State Incentive Grant (SIG) award. The SIG initiative, begun in 1997, is sponsored by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) and provides states with 3-year awards of 3 million dollars per year for the development of a prevention infrastructure. Activities that respondents reported to be fostered and/or enhanced by the SIG grants included cross-agency collaboration around prevention activities, identification of funding streams that could be pooled, and the development of statewide prevention plans.

Respondents also noted an increased effort at the state level to improve and standardize the quality of their prevention efforts to demonstrate to policymakers that prevention efforts are effective and result in positive outcomes for the participants. Several respondents noted, for example, that their states are no longer funding "homegrown" or "feel-good" prevention programs, but only those endeavors that have been demonstrated to be "model" or "promising" programs. This emphasis on moving toward science-based prevention programming is also driven by the SIG grants. In addition, respondents indicated numerous efforts to improve the status of prevention work itself. They noted that substance abuse prevention traditionally has been considered low-wage, low-skill work, a perception that they believed has increased the turnover rate among front-line staff and helped to undermine efforts to obtain legislative increases for prevention programming. Said one respondent:

Staff retention is an issue and inexperienced staff cannot do good community organizing. It's more difficult to do work in the environmental approaches than it is to be handed a curriculum and going to the classroom and doing that....We do an annual provider survey with our workers, and we've determined that every 2 years we have 40 percent of our workers turning around...how can you achieve outcomes if you don't have the same people? Because prevention's about human relations. It's not just about delivering a service.

Thus, many states reportedly are now establishing credentialing mechanisms for providers of prevention services. By moving prevention into the realm of "science," "best practices," and "certification," State Prevention Coordinators hoped to enhance the status and the visibility of prevention workers and the effectiveness of their endeavors.

Finally, many respondents said that as a result of collaborations established under the SIG initiative, statewide prevention efforts are no longer focusing on specific, isolated behaviors (e.g., teen pregnancy or youth substance use), but instead are viewing a constellation of behaviors as indicative of youth distress. Said one respondent from the Midwest, "We're really trying to link the crime issue and substance abuse issues together. And so when you're talking about crime issues and looking at prevention of crime issues, you're also preventing substance abuse. And so we're really trying to go for

a more integrated approach here.” Many states thus were combining funds from diverse departments (Public Health, Child and Family Services, Mental Health, Substance Abuse) in order to address the more comprehensive issue of “youth development.” Said the Prevention Coordinator from a New England State:

We see the same risk factors for people doing tobacco, drugs, getting pregnant, and violence. It's all similar; we have used a lot of our money in joint ways in the state. So the more money we have—we have a lot of money in teen pregnancy prevention—has greatly enhanced our drug prevention effort. We do not see them in isolation, and that's an important message.

In promoting these comprehensive prevention approaches, State Prevention Coordinators perceived their efforts to be supporting the development of overall healthy lifestyles for young people.

3.3 Reactions of State Prevention Coordinators to the Media Campaign

The contextual factors described in the previous section were a concern for State Prevention Coordinators across the country. Such factors may help us to better understand Prevention Coordinators' reactions to the Media Campaign, which are detailed below.

3.3.1 Ads Are Positive and Reinforce State Efforts

Many respondents familiar with the Media Campaign had gained that familiarity not through their positions as the State Prevention Coordinators, but from their leisure-time exposure to various media. Regardless of the source of the linkage, most respondents were generally positive about the Media Campaign ads and messages. In most instances, they reported that the goals of the Media Campaign were consistent with the prevention efforts being undertaken in their states. For example, the ads encouraging parents to participate in the lives of their young people resonated with state-level efforts to promote community building and adult mentoring. Said one respondent, “What I found most positive about the Media Campaign was the focus on parental involvement...that was really good.” Stated another, “That's a good message particularly for parents, and kids, too. I think that's very congruent with what we're trying to share with residents in [our state].”

Similarly, respondents were quite positive about the “What's Your Anti-Drug?” Campaign message. In large measure, this message reinforced state-level efforts not simply to reduce youth substance use (i.e., “Don't”), but to increase youth attention to development of healthy activities and lifestyles (i.e., “Do”). One respondent made the following comparison:

[We have] a quite popular program called [state] Drug-Free Youth. [S]DFY is the acronym, and there's a number of chapters around the state...It's really an alternative [activities] and mentoring type strategy. Youth leadership is the other piece...it kind of ties into the ONDCP's anti-drug type of stuff. So there's a lot of focus on recreational pieces and peer support, and just really convincing kids that drugs and alcohol use does not need to be a part of their life.

Very few respondents indicated that their state prevention efforts had been affected in any direct way by Campaign activities, but rather that the Media Campaign efforts “mirrored” or “reinforced” efforts that were already being undertaken in the states.

3.3.2 Adjust Message Form and Content to More Closely Match Local Issues

In spite of this overall positive perception of the Media Campaign ads and messages, respondents described an ongoing need for a media campaign that could readily adapt and respond to local needs and issues. One critique about the ads from a few of the states was that “the people in the ads don’t look like our kids.” This was an intriguing commentary, for there were clear and concerted efforts on the part of the Media Campaign to ensure a wide array of minority representation. Indeed, particular emphasis was placed on addressing the Media Campaign messages to African Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Hispanic Americans, American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Aleuts (3rd Semi-Annual Report, page 1-2). Interestingly, it was this effort to ensure minority representation that appears to have been an issue for several respondents. For example, in several venues where the population is predominantly white and the landscape largely rural, respondents seemed to recall only the ads that represented minority urban youth. Said one respondent from a far western state:

Where ONDCP has gone with the media campaign they have really hit on more of the minority, like they have gotten into the rap culture and this and that. But out west here we’ve got cowboys,...we have skaters, and extreme sport kinds of kids who are also risk takers that often are the ones who are using drugs, a lot of homeless kids. So I think you have to be more population specific when you are reaching out to some of these subcultures.

Yet, in another locale with an especially diverse population, while the respondent appreciated the content of the Media Campaign message, she also concentrated on what she believed to be a disparity between the youth represented in the Media Campaign ads and the young people of her state:

I think media always has an impact and they’ve got enough money for media and so the media is good. But do their kids look like our kids? No. I mean [our state’s] kids look real different than [other] kids. What they look like, and how they move their bodies and how they speak, how they speak English. The rhythm of their speech. Just like the Southern rhythm is different than the Northeast, the rhythm is different here. It would be nice to have some of [those ads] done with local kids. I think they do, like a cosmopolitan, an East-Coast kind of cosmopolitan kids, so you sort of throw in a Hispanic kid... and so the kids never really look like our kids. But I still think the ads are good.

Thus, while it would appear that the Media Campaign has done a good job of representing minority youth in the Media Campaign ads, some respondents perceived the targeting of these ads to the appropriate media markets to have been problematic. Some State Prevention Coordinators believed these ads could be more effective if they more closely represented—and therefore spoke to—their specific constituencies.

3.3.3 Resolve Problems with the Pro Bono Match

In a few states that hosted Phase I cities, respondents reported some difficulties with the local pro bono match program. At the outset of the Media Campaign, community groups were told that for each media time slot dedicated to Campaign ads, the Media Campaign would negotiate a pro bono match in which community groups might, for example, show their own public service announcements (PSAs). The content of these PSAs was reportedly flexible, and thus might emphasize issues of particular local importance, including youth tobacco or alcohol use.⁶ Several State Prevention Coordinators noted that the promise of media time buy-back was a critical leveraging point in their ability to develop relations with these community groups. And although the program was undoubtedly well intentioned, when the Media Campaign was unable to fulfill that promise, ties that had been established on the basis of that in-kind purchase sometimes fell apart.⁷

In a few instances, State Prevention Coordinators also reported that their relationships with local media were worse now than before the Media Campaign because the Campaign had supplanted ties they had been building with local media. The following account from a respondent in one Northeastern State is indicative of this problem:

What happened in [our state] is that the Governor's Prevention Partnership [was] the entity in the state that worked with ONDCP. We worked closely with them when they were reviewing the different media buys...you know, where ONDCP would support some of the buys in the different [media markets]. And then the Governor's Prevention Partnership would work with ONDCP to get some of those buys. I know there were some issues or some problems with ONDCP in that. Before ONDCP started their campaign where they were sponsoring or giving some media time or pieces of that, our statewide partnership was getting media in-kind. And then when ONDCP came out with [the Media Campaign] and was kind of sponsoring that, it was sort of cutting into what inroads [the Partnership was] making in getting buys or media in-kind services. I think it all got resolved, but there were some issues with that.

Such stories underscore the evaluation findings from other large-scale demonstration grants that such federally supported endeavors often have a significant impact on local communities. This influence derives in part from the influx of resources that accompany such projects, but also from the elevated profile that these efforts bring to localities. Respondents suggested that Federal representatives be mindful of this “reactivity effect,” since when there are problems with fulfilling such promises, the potential for negative fallout is often as great as was the promise for mutual benefit.

3.4 Positive Media Campaign Effects on Some State Efforts

Because the Media Campaign had never intended to create direct ties with State Prevention efforts, the Westat team did not necessarily anticipate that respondents would report any linkages to Campaign activities. Fortuitously, however, four respondents reported that the Media Campaign had, in fact, had a positive and long-lasting impact on their state prevention efforts. Importantly, all four

⁶ By September 2000, anti-tobacco themes were no longer eligible for pro bono match credit.

⁷ These respondents were apparently “caught” in changes to the pro bono match program that eliminated local matches. These changes occurred some time in 1991 for unknown reasons. See Chapter 1.

were from states where a major metropolitan area had participated in the formative Phase I of the Media Campaign. The three aspects of this early relationship that seemed most important to these respondents were (1) their participation in the shaping and targeting of the ads; (2) the Media Campaign's positive effect on their relationship with the local media; and (3) the direct linking of state or local prevention resources to the advertisements.

3.4.1 States Participated in the Shaping and Targeting of Ads

The few Prevention Coordinators who were enthusiastic about their state's relationship with the Media Campaign indicated that a critical facet of the Phase I relationship was that state representatives were invited to help craft ads to be more responsive to local needs. In addition to reflecting many respondents' concerns that the Media Campaign should be somehow "localized," these comments also suggest the importance states placed on being actively involved in these efforts. In short, states seemed most responsive to the Media Campaign when they had a voice in, and an opportunity to contribute to, the development of the ads that would be shown to their constituency. Said one state representative:

I think as a pilot or test state, it did allow us the opportunity to really get a better sense of how effective those media ads were. It also allowed us to look at how to shape those media ads and where to place them based on the ads and the culture from different areas of the state... You can't just take any media ad and place it anywhere...I think the lesson that we learned through that was that you really have to target an ad based on its content and the culture that you're targeting.

This concept was reinforced by other respondents whose states had participated in the Media Campaign Phase I activities. Specifically, they noted the importance of their staff members getting to participate in the development and targeting of the ads for the pilot city, and thus having a real voice in how the Media Campaign would play out in their locality: "[Major City] was one of the early test sites. My staff had reviewed the ads before they were released." This respondent added that she "expected to continue that" level of participation and involvement across the duration of the Campaign.

3.4.2 Campaign Created an Opportunity to Link State Prevention Resources and Programming to Advertisements

Closely linked to the above point is that the Media Campaign seems to have had the most positive impact in those few states where the Media Campaign message ("the anti-drug") was directly linked to local-level resources and services. More precisely, the majority of respondents across the states said that while the Media Campaign messages were "good" or "positive," those messages probably would not impact public health behaviors if audience members did not have an opportunity to connect to local resources for more information or for direct services. Thus, the four Phase I sites that seemed to have the most positive relationship to the Media Campaign were those in which the ads included a local contact number for viewers. Said one respondent from a Western State: "We have a system set up in [our state] for the response when the public has increased questions about that. We get all [of the Federal] materials that we share... We're right in the thick of it." Said another respondent:

[Major City] was one of the initial markets when they first started the ONDCP campaign, and so they put a lot of our information out there...We see a lot of those ads in the newspaper and on TV, and we've tagged a lot of those messages with our local 800 number. We have a prevention resource center, so we put our number there so people, when they see the ads, can call and get more information. And then we distribute publications that we get from the Federal Government.

Some state respondents were enthusiastic about being able to link target audience members to specific materials; others indicated that their prevention efforts benefited directly from this early connection with the Media Campaign. In one Western State, for example, the respondent noted the buy-in effect from having the conceptual framework of the Media Campaign shared with the state prevention workers:

What's been real interesting is to really have the logic behind that campaign shared with folks. Meaning that you intentionally try to shape behavior via that media campaign. We had so much in [pre-Campaign ads] that always seemed to address just the awareness aspect [of prevention], and trying to say, "Don't do this 'cause it's really going to hurt you. There will be consequences to your use." But when [the Media Campaign representative] was talking, he said, "You know, [increased awareness] was our *first* message, and then we move into our *next* message, which is encouraging parents to talk to their kids." That does have an influence, and then another message to say, "Create your own anti-drug," and those things. You can see a progression of messages... We could then almost piggyback on it, that it's just not something that's coming over the airwaves, but it does in fact relate to other programming pieces that we're doing.

In another state, the respondent noted that the Media Campaign reinforced local prevention efforts because the ad messages were directly relevant to those efforts:

I have to believe that there has been some connection, especially when they have done some ads that are focusing on parents, the importance of parents. And so it certainly makes it easier for us to then say we want to do these parenting programs. People understand why that's important.

These responses may suggest that a national media campaign can have a strong local impact when the higher-level messages and ads provide support and additional impetus for local-level efforts; in effect, when a synergistic connection is made between the messages and the on-the-ground prevention activities. In this way, community members can envision a direct tie-in between the media messages that they view and the programs in which they are being asked to participate. While the connection in these cases is somewhat serendipitous and was never part of an explicit strategy for prevention activities at the state level, they provide an important lesson for anyone wishing to extend the community effects of a national media campaign.

3.4.3 Create Buy-In From the Local Media

A few respondents noted that the Media Campaign was vital to their getting buy-in from the local media, which resulted in increased coverage of community prevention activities. In one instance, the respondent reported an effect from having been a pilot site for the Media Campaign:

Being up front as a pilot state I think helped enlist the support of the whole media industry... We have a very strong [statewide media association] that we work kind of closely with that represents much of the air media...anything that goes over the air, and they have been just fantastic... I think it was a very good fit. It was very positive for the most part. I think [the Media Campaign] was very factual and there was enough variety in terms of the ads...that stations that chose to play these had a broad choice of what to play based on the target areas that they served.

Another pilot-site respondent reported a strong relationship between the media and policymakers in his state. Although he did not make an explicit linkage between the strength of that relationship and the influence of the Media Campaign, he did suggest how such a relationship could be established and maintained over time:

I have a staff member whose job is to work on communication media issues, so where she's been able to develop relationships, either with the newspaper staff or the radio or television staff, we have gotten pretty good coverage in our press announcements and ads that we try to place... We do media awards once a year, so those newspapers or television and radio stations that do good public awareness on our issues, or cover our issues well, support prevention and so forth, we recognize in our annual conference. We try to work with the media as much as we can. And they tend to come to us.

These enthusiastic reports are encouraging, and suggest that at least in these fortuitous cases, the Media Campaign had a sustained impact on local communities when linkages between national and state-level efforts were actively developed and fostered.

3.5 Conclusion

In general, discussion with State Prevention Coordinators found that most respondents perceived the ads and messages to be relevant, timely, and largely supportive of state efforts to reduce youth substance abuse. The ads that stood out for respondents were those that targeted parental involvement, and the promotion of the idea that young people should develop an “anti-drug” in striving to create a healthy lifestyle. Despite the overall positive perception of the Media Campaign ads, however, there was little indication that the Media Campaign partnership or nonadvertising activities had made any real difference to state-level or associated local-level prevention efforts. Those few states that reported a strong and ongoing relationship with the Media Campaign had cities that were part of the Phase I rollout; importantly, however, not all states with a Phase I site reported such strong linkages.

Because there was never a concerted effort on the part of the Media Campaign to create these ties with state prevention systems, these findings were not unanticipated. Nevertheless, respondents did suggest areas in which the Media Campaign might consider enhancing its relationship with the states over the next couple of years in order to create a “win-win” situation for both parties. A key point raised by respondents was that when the partnership was most effective, Campaign messages had been linked to local resources and service infrastructures. Because many states are just now in the process of developing such an infrastructure, Campaign representatives will need to work collaboratively with State Prevention Coordinators to identify those areas that are the most developed and in which a linkage with the Media Campaign can be most effective. Additional issues that respondents said had

contributed to the development of mutually beneficial relationships included allowing state representatives to participate in the selection and targeting of Media Campaign ads, and having Campaign representatives work closely with the state to achieve buy-in from local media outlets.

4. Summary and Conclusions

4.1 Overview

As discussed in the previous chapters, the representatives from the national organizations and the State Prevention Coordinators are two very different sets of respondents. The respondents from national organizations were included because their organizations were reported to have direct ties to the Media Campaign. By contrast, the State Prevention Coordinators were contacted to determine to what extent the Media Campaign messages might have diffused into state-level prevention activities. Despite their different starting positions relative to the Campaign, the respondents more or less all shared the goal of decreasing youth substance use, although some were more singularly focused on this goal than others. This common objective provides a basis for the strengths that respondents identified in the Media Campaign ads and messages. The objective also underscores a common set of challenges that respondents indicated they would like to see addressed over the next 2 years of the Campaign. The main findings and respondents' recommendations for both groups are discussed below.

4.2 Respondent Findings

4.2.1 Ads and Messages Viewed Favorably

Both sets of respondents were quite positive about the Media Campaign ads and messages. The underlying concept of the "Anti-Drug," for example, is consistent with efforts across the nation to encourage young people to adopt healthy lifestyles and activities. The theme also supports a general movement in prevention science to educate people on what they should do (positive activities), rather than lecturing them on what they should not do. In addition, respondents overwhelmingly supported the positive parenting ads recently released through the Media Campaign. This is consistent with the findings from the National Survey of Parents and Youth (NSPY) that indicate a reasonably optimistic picture of Campaign effects on parents, based on data collected through June 2001. (See Evaluation of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign: Third Semi-Annual Report of Findings, October 2001.) It is interesting, however, that "brand recognition" was not high, in that perhaps a third of the national organization representatives and even more of the State Prevention Coordinators at first failed to recognize these as Media Campaign ads.

4.2.2 Respondents Support Use of Anti-Drug Ads to Combat Pro-Drug Messages

There was also broad consensus among respondents that the Media Campaign has done a good job bringing youth substance abuse issues onto the "radar screen" of public awareness. The Campaign—with its presentation of "healthy lifestyles"—acts as a counterweight to the influence of pro-drug messages in the media. Respondents also reported being encouraged by seeing an increase in

prevention-oriented public service announcements during prime time television hours, when viewers would be more likely to see and respond to the content of these messages.

4.2.3 Respondents Would Like to See Alcohol and Tobacco Addressed

Individuals across both sets of respondents remarked that ads addressing youth alcohol and tobacco use were “meaningfully absent” from the Media Campaign. Many recognized the inherent challenges in targeting these substances, including confronting the powerful lobby interests from distilleries or tobacco product manufacturers, the fact that neither product is an illicit substance, and the recognition that smoking and alcohol consumption are common cultural underpinnings of the rites of passage into adulthood. At least some also realized that the Campaign is prohibited from addressing any but anti-drug themes in the paid advertising component. Nevertheless, substance abuse treatment and prevention providers also recognize that both substances are common “gateway” drugs—use of tobacco and/or alcohol at a young age is a risk factor for later illicit drug use. A strong prevention effort, they said, should thus target these substances as well. In addition, a few respondents noted that regardless of whether alcohol and tobacco are legally sold throughout the country, sale to or consumption of either of these by minors is not legal.

4.2.4 Positive Responses to Collaboration

The representatives from national organizations most positive about and involved with the Campaign reported that they had been approached by Campaign representatives in a collegial way that emphasized mutual benefit and allowed them to make the best use of their own skills and resources. State Prevention Coordinators from the four states reporting serendipitous positive effects of the Media Campaign on their prevention efforts echoed this sentiment. They noted that the Media Campaign had invited them to participate in the shaping and targeting of ads to their constituency, and had endeavored to connect Campaign themes and messages with local programming.

These reports of effective partnering and collaboration came from those respondents who were most positive about the Campaign as an organizational partner and an endeavor that had positively affected their local prevention efforts. The national organizations presented a continuum in their views of and interactions with the Campaign. That the positive cases were relatively few suggests that one of the greatest challenges for the Media Campaign is the creation of effective partnerships. This overall picture of minimal Campaign impact on local prevention efforts is consistent with the NSPY finding of no significant change across Waves 1 and 3 in the percentage of parents who reported hearing a lot about anti-drug programs in the community, attending drug prevention programs in the past year, and attending parenting effectiveness programs in the past year.⁸

Several representatives of national organizations noted that while the initial relationship was robust, contact and communication with the Campaign had lapsed at some point in the past year. This decrease in communication had left them uncertain of the status of several collaborative efforts involving the pro bono match. Some of the State Prevention Coordinators, too, commented on their frustration and confusion regarding this initially attractive aspect of the Media Campaign. Although the Campaign never intended to create collaborative endeavors with state prevention systems, the Media Campaign affected some State Coordinators through their relationships with local media.

⁸ See Tables 3-71, 3-76, and 3-77 in the Third Semi-Annual Report of Findings, October, 2001, for the exact numbers.

These State Prevention Coordinators, too, expressed a desire for better communication on the present and future status of this pro bono match, which many regard as pivotal to their involvement with the Campaign.

4.3 Respondent Recommendations

4.3.1 Continue the Media Campaign, Adapting It to Changing Substance Use Patterns

Many respondents argued that the Media Campaign should not be time-limited, but rather should be part of an ongoing effort to combat youth substance use. As children continue to age into those cohorts being targeted by Campaign efforts, the messages will continue to have impact and appeal to these “new” adolescents and teenagers. In addition, a continuous effort would be able to target changes in the kinds of illicit substances young people have at their disposal. For example, several State Prevention Coordinators indicated that overall rates of youth drug use had not really decreased in their jurisdictions over the past few years; what had changed, however, was the “drug of choice.” Thus, while rates of cocaine or marijuana use might have gone down, some areas were seeing sharp increases in club drugs and methamphetamine use. Respondents thus suggested that the Media Campaign continue to evolve in tandem with the changing drug culture and address those substances that become more attractive to young people over time.

4.3.2 Include Alcohol and Tobacco

Many respondents felt the Campaign would be much stronger and more consistent with their substance abuse prevention efforts if it were to explore ways to address youth alcohol and tobacco use.

4.3.3 Work at Creating and Sustaining Effective Partnerships

National organization representatives who had experienced a decline in contact and communication with the Media Campaign over the past year were anxious to re-establish the connection. Those who had never enjoyed much of a relationship to the Media Campaign, including some not considering substance abuse prevention a high priority at this time, suggested they might be interested in developing a working partnership if the Campaign were to take the initiative in forging a mutually beneficial collaboration. Similarly, even though the Media Campaign has not maintained an explicit strategy of partnering with State Prevention Coordinators, should the Campaign wish to extend these linkages, many State Prevention Coordinators expressed a willingness to work more with the Campaign in the future. Several felt there could be mutually beneficial collaborations allowing Campaign messages to reach down more effectively to the local level, while helping strengthen and reinforce state and local efforts to build a prevention infrastructure and create greater public understanding of the benefits of prevention.

4.3.4 Target Policymakers and Decisionmakers with “Prevention Works” Messages

Several national organization representatives as well as state coordinators see changing the “political will” as one of the greatest challenges to ongoing prevention efforts. While giving many encouraging reports about the development of community coalitions to promote youth development or organization-supported efforts to discourage youth substance use, respondents also reported overall lack of financial support for these kinds of endeavors. Respondents noted that coalition-building and the development of prevention programming both require a significant influx of resources if they are to be effective and sustainable over time. Without support from state legislators, they said, these nascent efforts are likely to dissolve.

Consequently, although they generally liked the current ads and messages, several respondents suggested that the Media Campaign not focus solely on producing ads aimed at changing the social will (e.g., healthy lifestyles, positive parenting). In addition, they said, they would like to see ads that demonstrate to lawmakers and other decisionmakers that prevention works and can be cost-effective across a wide array of social categories (e.g., criminal justice, behavioral health, family services, etc.). Respondents noted that such legislative “buy-in” would be critical to creating a sustainable nationwide culture and climate of prevention.

Appendices

Appendix A

Discussion Guides

REPRESENTATIVES OF NATIONAL YOUTH SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS DISCUSSION GUIDE

Respondent(s):

Agency/Organization:

Position/Job title

Phone number:

Date and time of discussion:

Discussion Leader:

A. INTRODUCTION

First, I'd like to tell you a little bit more about the study, why your organization was chosen, and what we hope to accomplish. As you learned in our letter and follow-up phone conversation, Westat is conducting telephone discussions with representatives of 12 national youth service organizations as well as 50 State Drug Prevention Coordinators. We chose major organizations serving parents and youth that have local chapters or affiliates. Our goal is to gather your expert perspectives on youth drug use and the drug prevention climate and find out more about drug prevention policies and activities in which you may be involved. Westat is conducting this important study for the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) as part of a wider effort to track and understand drug-related attitudes and behaviors of American parents and youth.

The discussion should take about 50 minutes, and, with your consent, will be tape recorded to ensure accuracy. The only people who will know the identities of the respondents will be Westat researchers sworn to uphold confidentiality, and the data will never be reported in a way that will identify individual respondents. The results will be summarized in a report to Congress.

Do you have any additional questions before we begin? Do I have your permission to turn on the tape recorder? Thanks so much. Let's get started.

B. RESPONDENT BACKGROUND

Now I'd like to know more about your position and professional responsibilities

- B1. Can you briefly describe your role and main responsibilities in your organization? (*Probe on any role in publicity, advocacy, responsibilities and relationship to local chapters*). How long have you held this position? Before that, what did you do? (*Probe on professional experience, education, involvement in drug prevention.*)

C. PERCEPTION OF DRUG SITUATION (AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL)

Now I'd like to ask you a few general questions about your views on youth drug use and drug prevention policies and programs at the national level.

- C1. Overall, how would you characterize the drug use situation for young people across the country today as compared to 2 years ago? *(Probe for how much of a problem, compared to what, what drugs used/by whom, regional variations, impetus for any perceived changes, as well as bases of views)*
- C2. In your view, in the national arena, what priority is accorded to youth drug use relative to other youth-related issues? Has this changed over the past few years? If so, how, and why? *(Probe on how drugs seen relative to other issues (school violence, crime, truancy, etc)/sense of urgency, whether viewed as separate or part of a "package," whether some groups/organizations view it as more important, also probe bases of this assessment)*. Is this level of attention/priority appropriate and in proportion to the problem? If not, what do you think would create the impetus to give more appropriate priority to this issue?

- C3. How would you say coverage of youth drug use and drug-related issues in the national media (e.g., newspapers, television) compares to coverage of other youth-related social issues? Has the type and level of attention paid to drug-related issues in the media changed in the past 2 years, do you think? How?

D. DRUG PREVENTION EFFORTS OF THE ORGANIZATION

Now we'd like to talk to you about your organization's efforts in drug prevention.

- D1. We are interested in learning more about the (name of group/ organization). Can you tell us a bit about it, especially as regards drug prevention? (*Probe for mission/philosophy especially as regards drug prevention, target group(s)funding, relationship(s) to local affiliates/organizational structure*)

- D2. How does your organization define “prevention” (e.g., in relation to intervention, treatment)? What are the organization’s goals vis-à-vis drug prevention? Is drug prevention a specific focus of activity, or is it understood as part of a broader set of goals? Please elaborate.
- D3. Can you tell us, very briefly, about the two or three major drug prevention-oriented efforts/events and/or activities your organization currently organizes, sponsors or co-sponsors? Why did your organization decide to undertake these activities as opposed to any others you may have considered? (If there are more than 2 or 3 such activities, request any summary information about all such activities, if available; also request copies of any relevant program documents)
- D3a. Effort # 1: _____: (Probe on date initiated/duration, sponsorship/if collaborative; type of effort; funding; messages conveyed; target groups)
- D3b. Effort # 2: _____: (Probe on date initiated/duration, sponsorship/if collaborative; type of effort; funding; messages conveyed; target groups)
- D3c. Effort # 3: _____: (Probe on date initiated/duration, sponsorship/if collaborative; type of effort; funding; messages conveyed; target groups)

- D4. What materials (books, brochures, curricula) are currently being used in these drug prevention activities? Does this include any media materials (videos, films)? (Ask for copies of any relevant materials) Have these materials changed in the past few years? If so, how and why? Do you develop materials yourself (within the organization)? If so, who does this? (Ask for contact information for the relevant persons) If not, where do you get the materials you and/or your local affiliates use?
- D5. What is the relationship between the national organization and local affiliates in terms of use of these drug prevention materials? How do local affiliates determine which drug prevention materials to use in their events/activities? (*Probe on nature of national/local connection, degree of latitude left to locals, oversight, etc*) Do you have an idea/estimate of how extensively these drug prevention materials are used by local affiliates/chapters? (e.g. in what % of chapters, which states, etc) How do you know this? (*Probe on basis, e.g., data reporting source(s)*)

D6. We are interested in knowing about the involvement of various groups in helping to design materials or to plan and implement prevention-oriented activities/events/efforts. Have your efforts involved:

D6a. Youth---Which efforts? How?

D6b. Parents---Which efforts? How?

D6c. Other adult role models (e.g., teachers, coaches, youth group leaders, recreation workers, volunteer mentors)—Which efforts? How?

D7. What prevention-related activities/events/initiatives do you expect to undertake/sponsor/co-sponsor in the next 2 years? (Probe for basis—e.g., strategic plan, speech, whether budgeted for, whether represent continuation of current prevention emphases/philosophy or as representing a change)

E. PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF MEDIA CAMPAIGN

In this section, I will ask about how your drug prevention work may have been influenced by wider prevention efforts.

- E1. Is your organization working with other national groups/organizations/agencies on drug prevention-related issues, events, or activities? If so, can you tell us about the other organizations you are working with, when relationships were formed, and the nature of the collaboration(s)? Was your organization involved in collaborative drug prevention efforts at the national level any time during the past 2 years? If so, please describe.
- E2. When, and through what channels, did you first learn about the ONDCP-sponsored National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign? (If knows about Campaign, go on. If not, read ONDCP statement) What is your understanding of the Media Campaign's goals and messages? (If not answered previously) Can you talk about the extent and nature of your organization's interactions and involvement with the Campaign—currently, and over the past 2 years? (*Probe on how connection(s) made, perceived extent to which have shared goals/messages; joint or shared materials and/or activities*)

E3a. (If knows about Campaign) Overall, to what extent and in what way(s) do you think your drug prevention efforts may have been influenced by the Media Campaign over the past 2 years? (*Probe for direct as well as indirect influences, any “convergent” shifts in focus of activities, parallel messages, etc*) How would you characterize the Campaign’s role in national drug prevention efforts? What relationship do you expect your organization to have with the Media Campaign over the next 2 years?

E3b. (If knows little or nothing about Campaign) Has there been any significant change in the thrust of your prevention activities over the past 2 years? Could you talk about any such changes and what you think may have caused them?

F. OVERVIEW/FUTURE PRIORITIES

Finally, I'd like to close by discussing your views on future priorities in drug prevention.

- F1. Overall, what have been the largest challenges/barriers you have faced in your drug prevention work in recent years? What do you think the priorities should be in the national drug prevention arena over the next 2 years/why? What could the Media Campaign/a major national media campaign do to help promote these priorities?

Thank you so much for your time and thoughtful comments. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us or ask us before we close?

STATE PREVENTION COORDINATORS DISCUSSION GUIDE

Respondent(s):

State Agency/Organization:

Phone number:

Date and time of interview:

Discussion Leader:

C. INTRODUCTION

First, I'd like to tell you a little bit more about the study, how and why you were selected as a respondent, and what we hope to accomplish. As you learned in our letter and telephone follow-up, Westat is conducting telephone discussions with all 50 State Prevention Coordinators. Our goal is to gather your expert perspectives on youth drug use and the drug prevention climate in your State, and to find out more about current and future drug prevention policies and activities across the country. Westat is conducting this important study for the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) as part of a wider effort to track and understand drug-related attitudes and behaviors of American parents and youth.

This discussion should take about an hour, and, with your consent, will be tape-recorded to ensure accuracy. The only people who will know the identities of the respondents will be Westat researchers sworn to uphold confidentiality, and the data will never be reported in a way that will identify individual respondents. The results will be summarized in a report to Congress.

Do you have any additional questions before we begin? Do I have your permission to turn on the tape recorder? Thanks so much. Let's get started.

D. RESPONDENT BACKGROUND/ROLE IN DRUG PREVENTION EFFORTS

Now I'd like to find out more about your professional and work experience and especially about what you do as a State Prevention Coordinator.

- B1. Can you briefly tell us your main responsibilities in your current position? How does being a State Prevention Coordinator fit into the broader scheme of what you do? *(Probe on relationship to local entities, liaison and coordination functions, distribution of funds)* How long have you served as State Prevention Coordinator? Can you tell us a bit about how you came to be doing prevention work? *(Here you may probe on education background, past professional experience, as relevant)*

PERCEPTION OF DRUG SITUATION AT THE STATE LEVEL

Now I'd like to pose a few general questions about your views on youth drug use and drug prevention policies and programs in your State.

- C1. Overall, how would you characterize the drug use situation for young people in (name of State)? (Probe for how much of a problem, what drugs used/by whom, geographic or sociodemographic variations, such as urban versus rural, different patterns in different parts of state, or between minority or white youth, as well as bases of views) If respondent volunteers nothing about drugs of interest to the Campaign—e.g., marijuana, inhalants, Ecstasy, club drugs, then ask about these specifically.) How would you say the situation has changed over the past couple of years? (*Probe on evidence of new drugs, new user populations, etc*)
- C2. In (_____), in the past 2 years, have any legislative or policy initiatives (e.g., referenda, youthful offender drug court initiatives) been implemented that have affected the overall climate with respect to drugs and drug prevention issues? (*Probe on these initiatives and how respondent thinks they have influenced or are influencing the drug prevention climate in their state*) Are any such initiatives pending or just in their early stages? Can you speculate a bit on what you think their effects will be?

- C3. In your State, what would you say is the priority accorded to youth drug use as a public issue in the legislative and policy arenas? Has this changed over the past couple of years (since Fall 99)—If so, how/why? How does youth drug use stand relative to other youth-related issues? *(Probe on how drugs seen relative to other issues (school violence, crime, truancy, etc)/sense of urgency, whether viewed as separate or part of a “package,” whether some groups/organizations view it as more important, also probe bases of this assessment)* Do you feel the current level of attention/priority is appropriate? If not, what do you think would create the impetus to give more appropriate priority to this issue?
- C4. How would you characterize the attention paid to drug-related issues--especially youth drug use--in the media (key newspapers, tv news groups, radio) in (_____)? *(Probe on both level and type of attention and any variations across State or by media type)* How does this compare to media attention paid to other social issues (e.g., school violence, crime, etc.)? Would you say there has been a change in media attention paid to drug-related issues over the past couple of years (since September 1999)—if so, can you say how/why?

DRUG PREVENTION EFFORTS IN THE STATE

Now I'd like to ask you some more about the major drug prevention efforts in your state.

- D1. We are interested in learning more about major drug prevention efforts for youth and parents currently taking place in _____. But first we'd like to know how you define "prevention"? (*Probe on how viewed relative to intervention and treatment.*) Is a consistent definition of prevention applied across the State for funding purposes?
- D2. We would like you to briefly tell us about what you would consider the two major drug prevention efforts (activities, events, programs, campaigns) for youth and/or parents now underway in _____.
- D2a. Effort 1: _____. (*Probe on date initiated/duration; sponsorship/if collaborative; type of effort; funding; message(s) conveyed; target group(s), materials used*)

D2b. Now can you tell us about (Effort B): _____
(Probe on date initiated/duration; sponsorship/if collaborative; type of effort;
funding; message(s) conveyed; target group(s), materials used)

D3. Describe, very briefly, any other current efforts or efforts carried out over the past few years that you would also consider major?

D4. We are interested in knowing about the involvement of various groups in helping to design materials or to plan and implement these prevention-oriented activities/events/efforts. Have you involved:

4a. Youth---Which efforts? How?

4b. Parents---Which effort(s)? How?

4c. Other adult role models (e.g., teachers, coaches, youth group leaders, volunteer mentors, recreation workers)---Which effort(s)? How?

D5. What prevention-related activities/events/initiatives do you expect to undertake/sponsor/co-sponsor in the next few years? (*Probe for basis—e.g., strategic plan, speech, whether already budgeted for*)?

E. PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF MEDIA CAMPAIGN

In this second-to-last section, we would like to talk about connections between the drug prevention efforts in your State and national drug prevention efforts. In specific, we are interested in finding out about how your prevention efforts may have been affected by the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. (Please note: If respondent has already mentioned the Campaign, use what she has said to transition more gracefully into this section.)

E1. Can you tell a bit about what you know about the ONDCP-sponsored anti-drug media campaign, the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign? (If relevant) When, and through what channels, did you first learn about the Media Campaign? What is your understanding of the Media Campaign's goals and messages? Can you talk about the extent and nature of your interactions and involvement with the Campaign—currently, and over the past 2 years? (*Probe on how connection(s) made, perceived extent to which have shared goals/messages; joint or shared materials and/or activities*)

E2a. (For those who know about/have some connection with Campaign) Overall, to what extent and in what way(s) do you think your drug prevention efforts in (_____) may have been influenced by the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign over the past 2 years? (*Probe on direct as well as indirect influences, any shifts in focus of activities, parallel messages, etc*)? What relationship (if any) do you expect them to have with the Media Campaign over the next 2 years?

- E2b. (Only for those who claim no knowledge of Campaign) Have there been any changes or shifts of emphasis in your drug prevention efforts in (_____) over the past 2 years? What were they, and what do you think was behind any such shifts?

F. OVERVIEW/FUTURE PRIORITIES

Finally, in closing, I'd like to briefly discuss your views about future priorities in drug prevention

- F1. Overall, what have been the largest challenges/barriers you have faced in your drug prevention work in (_____) in the past few years? What do you think the priorities should be in drug prevention in the next 2 years? Why? What could the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign/any major national media campaign do to help promote these priorities?

Thank you very much for your time and thoughtful comments. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us or ask us before we end this discussion?

Appendix B Summary Form

SUMMARY FORM

TELEPHONE DISCUSSIONS WITH NATIONAL AND STATE PREVENTION LEADERS

Name(s) of Respondent(s):

Agency/Organization:

Position(s) and Title(s):

Date and Time of Discussion:

Name of Discussion Leader:

- S1. Briefly summarize your overall impression of how the discussion went. Include any contextual factors (noise, interruptions, etc) as well as any observations that might prove relevant to interpreting the discussion.
- S2. Briefly summarize respondent's role and main responsibilities with respect to drug prevention in his/her state/organization.

- S3. Drug situation nationally or in his/her state as compared to 2 years ago-- including any regional or urban/rural differences or differences across groups of youth.
- S4. Views on the priority accorded youth drug use among competing issues in a) the policy arena, and b) the media, and whether and how this has changed in past 2 years.
- S5. Existing or pending policy or legislative initiatives that may affect drug prevention climate.

S6. State's/organization's definition of prevention.

S7. Two major prevention efforts.

- S8. Future plans:
- S9. Knowledge of, connections with, and impressions of the NYAMC and the nature/extent of any perceived influence on the state's/organization's prevention efforts.
- S10. Suggested future prevention priorities/ways NYAMC and media could help.
- S11. In thinking about this discussion, is there anything you would do differently next time? What/why? Are there gaps that may warrant a callback?